

## **Review Article**

# **The surveying of modern state by analyzing Habermas thoughts**

**Alireza Askary and Alireza Saybani**

Bandar Abbas Branch,  
Islamic Azad University, Bandar Abbas, Iran.

[Received-28/02/2016, Accepted-09/03/2016, Published-25/03/2016]

## **ABSTRACT:**

Modern state has no real existence with any religious suffix or any school or territorial ideology. What is formed in the reality as the name of state is “human state” and the believers to the Islam have named it as Islamic modern state and the believers to the other religions or schools have named their government as the suffix of their belief because it expresses the thoughts of some of these people that build the state. For example The ISIL state has named itself as Islamic as well as the Islamic republic of Iran, Pakistan, Afghanistan and so on so that all of them claim the establishment of Islamic state while each one of the above states sometimes present incoherent definitions, programs and organizations from a unique origin in the name of Islam in the universe. There is no exact idea about what idea is been presented by Habermas but he believed in plurality and recognizes pluralism as formal in the society. Due to his opinions that are more critical than to be a provider of methods, it can be concluded that different ideas may come out of the heart of every religion which have the same value and no one has superiority over another since we have no criterion or scale to evaluate the superiority of one over another in the opinion of Habermas. Some of them may believe that they are closer to the reference text but that text is interpretable and because of that different interpretations and speeches come out of its heart. In this article, we take help from the ideas of Habermas and check his criteria by surveying the principals and criteria of modern state and the adaptation of the claimants of modernity state with it.

## **INTRODUCTION:**

Modern state is one of the most important achievements of modernity that is based on three principals of individualism, secularism and rationalism. Modern state is a civil state that rationalism, separation of state from religion, social contract, public advices, civil society, citizenship and individuality and organic bond of state with civil society are its basic characteristics and concepts. Authority, sovereignty and legitimation of modern state stand up from the volition of people and are firm based on the social contracts and the rules that are codified in the framework of public benefits. Modern state is the state of law and citizens, not the state of villains who are the followers of the paternal commands of a leader. In modern state, the authority is impersonal

meaning that the power acts based on the law and through bureaucratic channels and based on the defined criteria and the dominant discipline is a discipline that the law and not a person plays role in it.

In another definition, the power belongs to the offices not to the individuals and the limitations of authorities and responsibilities of offices are defined and controlled by the law. The power of modern state is limited to the public arena and it is not extended to the private arena. In modern state, there is an organic, mutual and full amplitude relationship between state institution and civil society institutions. In another definition, the modern state is not located on the top of society but it depends on it in economic, public and social terms. The civil society also

needs the help of state institution to coordinate the activities of its institutions and facilitate their formation and propagation. These institutional affiliations that have many economic, social and political aspects give this possibility to the state institution in order to be able to lead and manage the society in an efficient way and let the civil society to be able to restrain the power of state institution in an effective way and apply its democratic supervision on it. Because of these features, modern state has more capacity in running its goal in comparison with pre-modern state.

At first we introduce Yurgen Habermas and then analyze the cycle of his thought changes in order to survey his viewpoints on the modern state in brief. Habermas is the last remnant of Frankfurt school. He shows his interest to the formation of critical theory more than all members of this school of thought. Habermas has hope to the future of new society whereas he has the critical viewpoint toward it. He believed that while the new society is the slave of self-made problems, it also has the required capacities to come out of them (Parhizgar, 2004-36).

Habermas is the most effective contemporary philosopher of Germany due to his backgrounds and mental efforts. The public law of Germany is also affected by his thoughts (Punder, 2014-49). The environment in which he used to live in it and the historical changes that he saw in his life made him capable of posing fundamental questions and researches in modern bourgeoisie societies. The crisis that Marx was thinking about it was discussed by him in another way and analyzed and surveyed the matter of media, rational discourses and new crisis instead of paying attention to merely economic and superficial structures of culture in modern bourgeoisie societies. Accordingly, the concept of Habermas and his ideas is hardly depended on the time, location and thought circumstances in which he lived in.

The first part of state

Definition of the word of state

The word “government” in English is named as “state” and in French is called “Etat” (eta) and other European languages use cognate words that

all of them are derived from the Latin word of “status” that means situation and status (Hay, 2001) and it is cognate with “Ostan” and the suffix of “-setan” in Persian.

By the revival and epidemic prevalence of Romanesque law in continental Europe in the 4<sup>th</sup> century C.E, the word “status” was used to hint to the legal position of people (like religious authorities and patricians) and especially the position of the king. This word was also used to hint to the ministerial system of Rome that was a republic state. This word lost its function in hinting to some especial social groups in this period and more mentioned to the legal concepts and discipline and the executive system of making it (Skinner, 1989).

In English language, the word state is an abbreviation for word “estate” that is similar to its synonym in the old French language and means a person that has position and is wealthy because of that. The people who had the best and topmost positions were the rich and had the best social position as well and were the people that had the most authority (Vincent, 1992-43).

Using the word “state” in its recent concept is indebted of Makiawli’s writings, an Italian writer in the beginning of 16<sup>th</sup> century (especially the book of The Prince) in which he used this word in the closest concept of modern state concept (Bobbio, 1989).

State definition

There is no academic consensus on the appropriate and complete definition of state (Cudworth et al, 2007). The word “state” is pointing to a group of different but correlated theories about the phenomenon of politics that often cover each other (Barrow, 1993). Presenting a definition of this word can be a part of ideological conflicts because different definitions can lead to the different theories that are the base of government and consequently would credit the different political methods (Barrow, 1993, p: 10-11).

The most common definition for state belongs to Marx Webber (Dubreuil, Benoit, 2010) which explains that state is an obliging political organization that has a central state and is trying to establish the monopoly of canon power for

itself in a specified territory (Cudworth et al, 2007-95). Public groupings for state institutions are including ministerial bureaucracy, juridical system and religious or military organizations (Earle, Timothy, 1997).

According to the English oxford dictionary, the state A. is an organized political society that has one state, a public welfare and one notion. B. This kind of society can be an organizer of different parts of one federal republic especially in the United States of America (Oxford University Press, 1995).

### **The principals of modern state**

The state is been created as a historical phenomenon in a specific circumstances. The loss of state in most periods of history does not mean the loss of regulation and managing of the affairs of societies in these periods. Before the formation of state, there was a series of familial mechanisms, traditional rules, norms and rules for managing the affaires in the societies. In those periods, the politics was governorship and there was no state in the form of a better political power that is an owner of a legal discipline and an impersonal institution (Vincent, 1992, p: 27-36). The modern government, the history of which refers back to 12<sup>th</sup> to 16<sup>th</sup> centuries AD, implicates on a kind of legal discipline or an impersonal and distinctive institution that has the ability of managing a defined jurisdiction. This state is a distinct form of public power in which the lord and obedient are apart and forms an excellent political power in a distinct jurisdiction (Held, 2007, p: 33-34). In this view, all of the modern states are nation-state.

Modern state is one of the most important achievements of modernity that is based on three principals of individualism, secularism and rationalism. Modern state is a civil state that rationalism, separation of state from religion, social contract, public advices, civil society, citizenship and individuality and organic bond of state with civil society are its basic characteristics and concepts. Authority, sovereignty and legitimation of modern state stand up from the volition of people and are firm based on the social contracts and the rules that are codified in the framework of public

benefits. Modern state is the state of law and citizens, not the state of villains who are the followers of the paternal commands of a leader. In modern state, the authority is impersonal meaning that the power acts based on the law and through bureaucratic channels and based on the defined criteria and the dominant discipline is a discipline that the law and not a person plays role in it.

In another definition, the power belongs to the offices not to the individuals and the limitations of authorities and responsibilities of offices are defined and controlled by the law. The power of modern state is limited to the public arena and it is not extended to the private arena. In modern state, there is an organic, mutual and full amplitude relationship between state institution and civil society institutions. In another definition, the modern state is not located on the top of society but it depends on it in economic, public and social terms. The civil society also needs the help of state institution to coordinate the activities of its institutions and facilitate their formation and propagation. These institutional affiliations that have many economic, social and political aspects give this possibility to the state institution in order to be able to lead and manage the society in an efficient way and let the civil society to be able to restrain the power of state institution in an effective way and apply its democratic supervision on it. Because of these features, modern state has more capacity in running its goal in comparison with pre-modern state.

### **The relationship of modern state and market**

Both the theoretical and experimental considerations represent that there is a mutual, organic and powerful correlation between the genesis of modern state and economic expansion. The modern state was basically formed in the process of industrial revolution and capital procreation from the historical perspective and played an important role in the formation and inflorescence of bourgeoisies system. The modern state played a vital role in the economic expansion of modern world by creating a monolithic and central system, confirming the governorship of law, binding over and making

the power to the law impersonal, creating a central and efficient bureaucracy, consolidating the national unity, expanding the common language and culture, equalizing the standards and rules, creating pervasive national market, creating legal system and guaranteeing the function of market in the framework of laws, creating the required institutions and structures for functioning in the market, regulating and coordinating the activities in the market and providing a secure, safe and steady environment for investment. On the other hand, both the theoretical and experimental considerations represent that immoderate and unconsidered interference of state in economic affairs plays as an obstacle against the economic development. The dominance of state institution on the economy eliminates the individual motivation for the efficient improvement, attenuates the financial discipline of the whole system and leads to unproductive activities and the clump wastage of resources.

There are many theories in the zone of the economic, political and social sciences that emphasize the dangers of expand interferes of state in the economic affairs. Based on the theory of "employer-employee", bureaucrats and the state employees are like the operatives of private part who are trying to maximize the use of their economic profit and because of the unequal distribution of information between the people (employer) and the bureaucrats (employee) and the higher information of bureaucrats about the governmental institutions, the majority of the people cannot have an effective supervision on the function of bureaucrats. Therefore, the interference of state in the economy will change to a tool in the hands of bureaucrats to secure their personal benefits. Based on the bribery theory, the incorrect interference of state in economy can encourage the members of the society to effect on the decisions of bureaucrats and state employees by using a part of resources for unproductive activities like paying bribes to bureaucrats and the state employees to overcome the obstacles that can be a cause of resources wastage and corruption expansion. Based on the institutional indurations theory on the other hand,

the interference of state in economic affairs leads to the appearance of structural inflexibility and institutional in durations in the market, prevents the efficient function of the market and leads to undesired devotion in the long-duration. Consequently and based on the theory that is famous to Austrian school, in a complex universe with numerous economic variables that are changing uninterruptedly and there is considerable invalidity around their future value, the amount of data required for the effective intervention of state in economic affairs is so high that can make this matter practically impossible. Above theories, with the experience of many countries directly show that interferes of state in economic affairs can have expanded negative consequences. But we cannot take the conclusion from these observations that the interference of state in economic affairs is basically and always incorrect and detrimental.

This matter leads to a one-dimensional and simple understanding of state and ignores the necessity of resistance against the economic incompetency of free market. The experiences of developing a free economy show that the incompetency of market is real and requirements of its elimination are the participation of state institution, at first. And stopping the interference of state in economic affairs does not lead to the appearance of free economic, at second. Doing this job requires an active corporation and leadership of the state in creating the required institutions for a healthy growth of free economy. In total, the state institution has a basic and undeniable role in the matter of economic development the main cases of which include: creating legal framework, guaranteeing the function of market in the framework of law, resolving the incompetency of market, creating institutions, coordinating the institutions, regulating the macro economy, presenting a strategic outlook, managing the process of structural changes, regulating the stresses of structural changes and producing and executing social orders. The interfere of state in economics affairs would become successful when it is based on a clear strategy that is able to prevent an uncontrolled growth of danger of state and

decrease the inappropriate consequences of state interfere in economic affairs. This matter requires a correct designing of state interference in economy and using effective mechanisms in order to control and maintain the discipline of state institutions. Achievement in this job has connections to the political structure of society.

In total, doing this job is easier and more possible in the framework of a democratic political framework. Recognizing the structure and features of modern state and finding the mutual relationship between modern state and economic development will provide an appropriate criterion for checking the causes of Iran's economic and political retardation. In the believes of many of intellectuals, the causes of Iran's economic and political retardation must be searched in the old structure features of power in Iran and the factors that lead to their continuity.

#### Habermas and Liberating Wisdom

Habermas benefits from the history of German philosophy more than the other Frankfurt school members. He believes in the Liberating Wisdom and getting the peoples' life better. The philosophical root of Habermas' job and his attachment to the critical school had caused him to know the duty of presenting a solution and helping the others for sociology beside the analysis and specification that all of this has made him a great and different scientist. Pivazi states this difference in a shortest form: "The only investigational goal of Habermas was to predict and justify a better universal society that makes more possible chances for peace, unity and good fortune. A more rational and matched with public needs society and not matched with dictator powers" (Pivazi, 2005-33).

Modernity, an unfinished project in the viewpoint of Habermas

In the definitions of the words new and modern, Habermas emphasizes the relationship with the past and ancient past and knows the awareness of being in a new and modern era as the awareness of an ancient pattern and the necessity of passing through it and applying a new pattern: "The term modern, with its different concepts and meanings, repeatedly states the awareness of an area or period that knows itself related to an

ancient past in order to assign itself through a transition outcome from ancient to new... in other words, the term modern manifested and recrudesced exactly in a time in Europe that an awareness was formed toward a new area through the revival of the relationship with ancients. Besides, being ancient or ancient archaism counted as a pattern when they must be revived and remade by the help of different patterns of imitation." Habermas shows one of the symbols of this awareness in the French explanatory era that the spells of classic remnant of ancient world that have entrapped the ghost of other eras in its cushion broke with looking at the past and believe in the unlimited development of knowledge. Habermas knows the romantic ghost of 19<sup>th</sup> century from the heart of idealistic Middle Ages that intensified the awareness of modernity and made it as a radical awareness. By the way, he knows this contrast between the tradition and now as an abstract contrast. It is from then on \_the middle of 19<sup>th</sup> century\_ that "Novelty" dominates and obsolesces because of the novelty of next style. In Habermas belief, historical classic has lost its authority, but every modern work of art will be located in the position of authority if counted modern as an authentic and original in its time and can get the power of a classic reference for the future generations. Finally, we can speak of the classic modernity.

#### Yurgen Habermas and government

Yurgen Habermas believed that the framework basis of giant structures that have been used by many of Marxists theorist to explain the relationship between the state and economy is very simplistic. He felt that modern states play a main role in making the economy structural through making the economic activities lawful and being productive or consumer in a vast volume and redistribution of the wealth from the state activities. Because of all of these reasons, Habermas believed that states cannot take a positive responsibility in making the benefits of economics levels in society.

Edgar, Andrew (2005) believed that the modern theory of politics is extremely based on the centrality of state and stated that maybe the state is not more than a combination of reality and a

fictional abstraction after all these opinions and its importance maybe much less than a level that we consider for it. He thought that the theory of politics was focused on the abstraction institution more than enough and did not pay enough attention to the real affairs of the state. In Foko's idea, the existence of state had no necessity. In his belief, the theorists of politics should test the changes in the behavior and activities of state in order to be able to understand the changes in the nature of state instead of efforts to understand the activities of states by analyzing the state property (Melossi, Dario, 2006).

Jürgen Habermas and consultative democracy  
Habermas knows the succedent bourgeoisie as an incomplete realization of thought in history and inconsistent and uncoordinated exploitation of it besides the pathology of modern societies. He is trying to state the sanctities and credit claims provide the background of the formation of collaboration, common certainties, pragmatism and agreement for epidemic values by applying the concept of subsistence universe, communicatory action and mutual recognition. In his idea, conversation and reasoning are efforts to relief the crumbled agreements in traditional and pre-modern societies. But we should not expect that reasoning to lead to agreement routinely. The point is that we cannot rely on anything except the norms that are in the process of reasoning. In this matter, consultative democracy is the project of characterizing the rights and duties that are necessary for the continuation of reasoning. This kind of democracy changes the attention focus from final results to the features of processes from which these results are obtainable.

By this way, there is a communicatory motivation toward the resolving in the middle of multiplicity, contrasts and diversities of modern life. Without this motivation, there are no rational situated for severity and pressure as the methods of forming public wills and resolving the conflicts.

#### **Habermas' thought evolution process**

Political and theoretical background of Habermas is saying that: "what really determined my political viewpoints was the year 1945". He was

the member of Hitler youth at the age of 16 in that year and was sent out to the western defense borders of Germany. He knew the end of war as the experience of manumission (Dews, *Autonomy and Solidarity*, p.77). Even though political culture was sunk in itself for a while (inhibited) and prevent from an open and exposed facing, there was the public culture of optimism among the youth (Ibid, p: 77-188). He has written with regard to these adventures: "we believed that spiritual and moral renew was necessary and inevitable (Ibid, p: 43)". However that Habermas did many assessments for possibilities, he achieved a clear and defined concept of democracy. For example, after 1945 "we are living in a daily and deep experience of life that the things are getting better by presenting a further introduction of democracy" (Ibid, p: 189). Habermas knew the meaning of democracy and its importance as a historical achievement in terms of ontology. He knew the democracy as a warrantor to defend from the benefits of democracy in the philosophical level against those who were focused on its detriments and harms or modern dominant features. Habermas writes: "this reality that the person will be aware of the existence of these findings (acquisitions) just at the moment that they are threatened deserves a philosophical attention (Ibid, p: 9-138)".

The commitment of Habermas to the democracy can be followed in German "further education" after the war. This causes hilarity to achieve a federal republic that is trying to get the balanced and democratic political cultures of England, French and the United State (Ibid, p: 79). Anyway, a strong and deep feeling of doubt and quandary was developed because it became obvious very soon that the democratic change was not happening as fast as he hoped. First, there was a necessary alliance and connection in universities and political systems which created that panic that there is no real disconnection with the past (Ibid, p: 4-43, 47, 78-80). Habermas stated that this was the student commotion of the late 1960s that find its way through the hard authoritarian tendencies (Ibid, p: 36-229). This matter was enough to reveal the life story in the

period of Adenauer that “we are all democrats now”.

However, Habermas was consternated because of the vulnerability of German political culture in the early 1977. An excuse to leave the democratic values was made by the return of the economic crises, advent of terrorism and the conservative elites’ abuse of this situation in order to fix the feeling of stress and anxiety and reduce the feeling of “realism” (Dews, *Autonomy and Solidarity*, p: 48). In the later period, he has spoken of “The second life fiction”. This is a political determinative belief that the process of reuniting of Germany has calmed a separate nation from the democracy responsibilities. Based on the belief of Habermas, this prevalent belief is dominant that old Federal Republic was incapacitated in the radiance of killing Jewish (Holocaust) by liberal democracy. The second life fiction is from by that. Basically, the renewed Germany can continue its last research for separation from Western Europe national identity now.

Habermas emphasizes that this functional theoretical landscape should include this contrast tendencies. In this regard, his relationship with the critical theory of Frankfurt school is very important. The pivotal comprehension and intuition that Habermas gets from this tradition and especially from Herbert Marcuse is that we always need the manifestation in a limitation in which we are participant in its consciousness in common satisfaction and resignation. This satisfaction and assignation confirm the present circumstances existing in our thought without the test of “concept” behind these circumstances and mean the tangible possibility that can be changed by historical development.

One-dimensional and unfair theoretical approach cannot probably be equitable in both “conceptual” and existing circumstances that are behind them. Habermas is interested to avoid the philosophy of hope and disappointment with this imagination. In spite of his deep impression from Theodor Adorno who was an example of this philosophy, Habermas does not agree to take this aspect of his thought. Habermas is sure that this philosophy does not have many results and the

person can enter the cycle of hope and disappointment just from the other ways. The philosophy can merely recognize the hidden mutilated and repressed reason in this universe and cannot be sure of the realization of possibilities in this world.

It is important to emphasize on this concept of reconstructive approach for the effort of Habermas in order to connect the theory and act. This approach specifies hard limitations on the things that Habermas can say as a philosopher about the basic problems of modern societies. Reconstruction (in a fallible method) is only good for knowing the circumstances and (conceptual) hypotheses that are hidden behind our daily acts and behaviors. This circumstance is a determiner for a thing that we are trying to get in spite of our unawareness in the exposure of our feelings and beliefs. Reconstruction can frequently make us more aware from the cause of the action, but it cannot tell us the quality of the action. So, in the manifest of Habermas theory, it is only the reconstruction of circumstances that make the democratic surveillance of citizenship possible on their common life. The basic questions of democracy can be only answered via democracy. While the reconstructive approach put some limitations on the things that Habermas can say as a philosopher, he has activity on the roles and duties of a citizen and a liberal. Doing this, he has presented an example of action and behavior on which his theory is based. Habermas has frequently entered the political velitations from the 1950s from the time of publishing the articles about the philosophical issues and sociology in the magazines that address the most of the people (Wiggerhaus, *The Frankfurt school*, p: 539) until his recently interferes in the issues like Persian Gulf War and German confederacy. In fact, he has played a significant role in the fixation of the special public role for liberals in Germany. Habermas wanted to find an intermediate position between the elitist and impractical liberals who are claimant for having objective truth on the one hand and liberals with claims and pretend to the power and have hoped to play a role in politics on the other hand. Habermas finds a place for liberal as a catalyst and

expeditor in the critical discussion in the general area of politics between these two roles. Here, the liberal chooses a prescription about will-formation and the prescriptive democratic and self-understanding (Habermas, Heinrich, Heine, p: 93). It means that he has chosen an egalitarian and fallible theory and sets faith and belief in the place of public area to open his faith, belief and theories to the power of claims and their resources.

Choosing some factors of the interpretation concept that exposes the work of Habermas was not done in order to deplete his theoretical efforts for a set of socio-psychological experiences; but it was done in order to present a general background to show that he handled with democratic theory. An important part of that participation was an effort to show that partisanship from the democracy is not a personal and psychological issue. Based on his reconstructive approach, Habermas wanted to show that a special kind of democracy formed the infrastructure of political and social acts and behaviors in the western liberal societies. This means that democracy is not merely a personal or even plural priority or preference. Rather, it is a thing that we supported in our effort in order to have a social peaceful life (Dews, Autonomy and solidarity, p: 98).

**Conclusion:** Some people have presented the civil society, state and market as three basic components of social system. The main question is that whether these three components can be a theoretical and analytical appropriate framework for analyzing the social system? Where should we start surveying the triple relationship of “state, market and civil society”? Farabi has discussed these levels in Medina and has divided the society in a way that one of its parts is for salespeople and the other part is for soldiers and so on. But for instance, it can be said that the concept of state is very anarchical (and not vague) for us. Ibn Khaldun and Khaje Nezam Almolck have used this concept and the concept of state has been used again in the era of Ghajar. But in all of these cases, it has been used for rather different meanings. However, the west has named what we call government as state or

estate. Also, the similarity or the difference between the state and government are not obvious for us. There is a conceptual anarchy in the thinking tradition of the west in the civil society or the similarity of civil society and market. From the viewpoint of Hegel, the market has changed to the civil society and basically the civil society is the system of needs and exchanges. Marx has not spoken of a civil society and Habermas uses the term of public arena. The government of Europe continent and their common currency show that the civil arena does not limit to the boundaries of countries and the economy also becomes trans-boundaries. Habermas and Gadamer both supported the pattern of united Europe. The thinkers tried to reconstruct the civil arena after Hegel. Since Hegel did not reconstruct it, and discussed the topic of government and state. So, it was stated public arena should stand up by itself due to the change of economy and politics and it is here that the people are not subdued and they are themselves although there are still authority centers as obstacles. If this arena places other arenas in it such as the government, this reconstruction is been completed. But now, it is not the matter that all people should govern in order to live like humans. Rather, they should partly save their rights and responsibilities instead of giving them completely to the government while the government has also some duties. They should not leave the public arena in a way that there just remains political and economic arena. Habermas is been described as a first German theorist of democracy in the intellectual phase of post-war period. By this way, this issue that many of works of Habermas do not speak about democracy systematically may seem to be paradoxical. Democracy is a background issue because the focus of Habermas is on the important question of sustainability of society and modern culture as a whole. Accordingly, the consultative kind of democracy is the axial component of Habermas answer to this matter.

Habermas belongs to the explanatory tradition and its dependent ideals about the development and freedom. He believed that the mankind can

go further personal benefit, prejudice and dogma by using wisdom. The trust of Habermas to the wisdom has remained stable in spite of this reality that many events happened in order to attenuate the explanatory optimism in western societies. The mankind definitely use wisdom, but this is exactly this function of the wisdom that is been criticized as the cause of the recent modern problems of human beings. Questions are posed on this matter that: are there any radicals for wisdom to be used in such a way to realize the public benefits?

The work of Habermas prepares a positive answer to these questions. He wants to proof this point that the human wisdom is naturally a moral and worthy force. Anyway, in the objective framework of Habermas analysis, it seems that the existing problems of modern state are disappearing oftentimes. It is analyzed sometimes that the theory of Habermas is very distant from the scientific experiences. However, if we are able to know the insistence of the linkage of theory and action as a totally Marxist interest, Habermas will definitely place himself in this tradition. In fact, the two answers to the recent crisis are because of the view that Habermas has named himself as "The last Marxist". Although the process of Habermas work can be studied from different perspectives, here we have tried to perceive it as a continuous effort in the linkage of philosophical and theoretical dimensions of theory. The efforts of Habermas for making this linkage arrived to each other around the concept of democracy. So, it is important that the motivator background of his commitment to democracy be surveyed at first.

Jurgen Habermas believed that the framework basis of giant structures that have been used by many of Marxists theorist to explain the relationship between the state and economy is very simplistic. He felt that modern states play a main role in making the economy structural through making the economic activities lawful and being productive or consumer in a vast volume and redistribution of the wealth from the state activities. Because of all of these reasons, Habermas believed that states cannot take a

positive responsibility in making the benefits of economics levels in society. Edgar, Andrew (2005) believed that the modern theory of politics is extremely based on the centrality of state and stated that maybe the state is not more than a combination of reality and a fictional abstraction after all these opinions and its importance maybe much less than a level that we consider for it. He though that the theory of politics was focused on the abstraction institution more than enough and did not pay enough attention to the real affairs of the state. In Foko's idea, the existence of state had no necessity. In his belief, the theorists of politics should test the changes in the behavior and activities of state in order to be able to understand the changes in the nature of state instead of efforts to understand the activities of states by analyzing the state property.

#### REFERENCE:

1. Pitter, Kivisto, Fundamental thoughts in Sociology, translated by Manuchehr Saburi, Tehran, Ney publication, 1999, p: 8-107
2. Michael, Each, Leasnaf, Political philosophers of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, translated by Khashayar Deihimi, Tehran, Kuchak publication, 1999, p: 1-430
3. Michael, Pivazi, Yurgen Habermas, translated by Ahmad Tadayon, Tehran: Hermes, 1999, p: 119
4. Mohammad, Akhbari, the quarterly of economic researches process, 19<sup>th</sup> year, number 60, winter 2011, p: 81
5. Yun, Kripe, Modern social theory from Parsons to Habermas, translated by Abbas Mokhber, Tehran: Agah publications, 1999, p: 306
6. Yusef, Abazari, The thought of Sociology, Tehran: Tarhe Now publications, 1998, p: 27
7. Cohen, Ronald (1978). "State Origins: A Reappraisal". *The Early State*, Walter de Gruyter
8. Dahl, Robert (1973). *Modern Political Analysis*, Prentice Hall
9. John Ralston Saul, *Voltaire's Bastards* (New York, Vintage, 1993)
10. Poggi, G. 1978. *The Development of the Modern State: A Sociological Introduction*. Stanford: Stanford University Press
11. Roosevelt, Anna C. (1999). "The Maritime, Highland, Forest Dynamic and the Origins of Complex Culture", In Salomon, Frank & Schwartz, Stuart B. *Cambridge history of the Native peoples of the Americas: South America*, Volume 3. Cambridge University Press